

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 Northern District of California
10 San Francisco Division

11 JAMES M. ICARD, No. C13-05097 LB
12 v. Plaintiff,
13 ECOLAB, INC.,
14 Defendant.

**JUDICIAL REFERRAL FOR
PURPOSES OF DETERMINING
RELATIONSHIP OF CASES**

15 _____ /
16
17 On October 31, 2013, defendant Ecolab, Inc. removed a state court action to federal court. See
18 *Icard v. Ecolab, Inc.*, No. CGC-09-495344 (San Francisco Superior Court). It was assigned to the
19 undersigned. Ecolab also filed an administrative motion asking the undersigned to relate this action
20 to two other actions it previously removed and which were heard by Judge Hamilton.

21 Administrative Motion, ECF No. 2; see *Icard v. Ecolab, Inc.*, No. C10-00410 PJH (N.D. Cal. Jan.
22 28, 2010); *Icard v. Ecolab, Inc.*, No. C11-03258 PJH (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2011).

23 Under Civil Local Rule 3-12(b), Ecolab should have filed its administrative motion in the
24 earliest-filed case (*i.e.*, *Icard v. Ecolab, Inc.*, No. C10-00410 PJH (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2010)). Ecolab
25 instead filed its administration only in this action. Accordingly, the undersigned refers this action
26 (and Ecolab's administrative motion) to Judge Hamilton to determine whether it is related to either
27 *Icard v. Ecolab, Inc.*, No. C10-00410 PJH (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2010); *Icard v. Ecolab, Inc.*, No. C11-
28 03258 PJH (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2011).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

2 || Dated: November 1, 2013

LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California**